

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,933	09/30/2003	Eugeni Namsaraev	502.02US	7872
53220	7590 10/02/2006		EXAM	INER
Chief Intellectual Property Counsel			GUIDRY, GUY L	
Affymetrix, Inc.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3420 Central Expressway			ARTONII	FAFER NUMBER
Santa Clara, CA 95051			1636	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commence	10/676,933	NAMSARAEV, EUGENI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Guy Guidry, Ph.D.	1636				
 The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply 	on appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r tition. y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 September 2003</u> .					
· — ·	This action is non-final.					
, — , — , — , — , — , — , — , — , — , —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
· —	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-34 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) \(\sum \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9	948) Paper No(s	Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application				
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claim(s) 1-14, drawn to a method of constructing a product polynucleotide using populations of truncate-containing oligonucleotide synthesis products, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- II. Claim15, drawn to a method of constructing at least one product polynucleotide wherein the scaffold does not provide complementary nucleotides along substantially the first or second oligonucleotide, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- III. Claims 16-31, drawn to a method of appending at least one extending oligonucleotide to an end of a single-stranded polynucleotide, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- IV. Claims 32-33, drawn to kits for labeling oligonucleotides, classified in class435, subclass 6.
- V. Claim 34, drawn to a method of ligating a first oligonucleotide to a second oligonucleotide, classified in class 435, subclass 6

Inventions of Groups I-III, V are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect;

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/676,933

Art Unit: 1636

(2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are functionally distinct, each from the other and thus one does not render the others obvious. The methods of Groups I-III, V comprise steps which are distinct from each other: Group I comprises an unstable partially duplexed hybridized scaffold; Group II comprises a scaffold complementary to the entire length of the center oligonucleotide such that the duplex is stable under ligation conditions; Group III comprises ligating an extending oligonucleotide to a single stranded polynucleotide and Group V comprises conditions wherein a ten-fold molar excess of truncated forms of the firsdt oligonucleotide inhibits the ligation of the first oligonucleotide to the second oligonucleotides by less than a factor of three.

Inventions of Group IV and Groups I-III, V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the kit for labeling oligonucleotides can be used for another process of than truncate-containing oligonucleotide ligation synthesis. The kit could also be used to label small oligonucleotides for *in situ* hybridization assays of mRNA expression in tissue sections.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are

subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Page 4

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants. Thus, the

Application/Control Number: 10/676,933

Art Unit: 1636

operation and function of these different methods are distinct from each other and therefore are capable of supporting separate patents.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the

Application/Control Number: 10/676,933

Art Unit: 1636

record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Guy Guidry, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-7928. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Remy Yucel, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0781. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) (http://pair-direct.uspto.gov) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling

Application/Control Number: 10/676,933 Page 7

Art Unit: 1636

please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

Guy Guidry, Ph.D.

Examiner

Art Unit 1636